

GREEN-MOUNTAIN FREEMAN.

Liberty and Equality, Man's common birthright, God's richest gift—Religion and Law their defence.

BY POLAND & BRIGGS.

MONTPELIER, VT., THURSDAY, AUGUST 28, 1845.

VOL. II, NO. 35.

THE FREEMAN.

For the Freeman.
CONSISTENCY OF CHRISTIAN ABOLITIONISTS—No. 4.

Although slavery has found a place of refuge in the church, yet it evidently is but a precarious one, wholly dependent on a certain contingency, over which it can exercise no legitimate control. It never had, it never can have any legitimate right in the church. And as it cannot abide the light, being itself but a creature of darkness, the inmates of this great bulwark have only to let their light shine, and its existence there ceases. But before we farther proceed it seems necessary that due attention should be paid to a reply which, since my last, has appeared in the Freeman. So far, however, as this reply is made up of objections and arguments which have already been under consideration, I must, in order to avoid repetition, pass over it, and for a reply refer your readers back to my first and second communications. The writer appears to be very sanguine that I have wholly mistaken his position, and that consequently I have only been fighting with a man of straw. But my position was purely defensive; I did not design to make an attack on him, or on any one else. Very serious objections, as I thought, were urged against myself and others, which I endeavored to meet in the best way I could. But if I was mistaken—if it was indeed but a man of straw with which I had to contend—surely I rejoice in it; for there is not only less danger, but more honor in fighting with a man of straw than with one composed of more substantial material. I did not suppose the writer to be of that class of people who are opposed to all organization, though he seems to have inferred that from some of my remarks. On the contrary, I inferred from remarks which appeared at different times in the Freeman over his signature, that he was, at least, so far as his views and feelings were concerned, with the True Wesleyans. But it appears that, after all, I have been greatly mistaken in the matter; for he now gives us to understand that the organization for which he contends is to be of an anti-sectarian principle, an organization, it would seem, in opposition to all sects, and yet, of itself, to be no sect. What kind of an organization this will be, or how it will succeed, time only will show. But if we may judge of the future by the past, and of this enterprise by that of similar ones which have appeared in our country, we shall be safe in the conclusion that it will either end in the creation of a new and distinct sect, or else in a disorganization. I do not call in question Brother Pomeroy's sincerity in this strange movement any more than he does mine. But I have lived long enough in the world to learn that the heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked; consequently, that it is possible for men, who are the greatest sectarians, to honestly think themselves divested of all sectarian principles. The unity of the church I acknowledge to be very desirable. But all attempts to promote this, so far as my observation has extended, by high professions of anti-sectarianism have served to scatter Christ's sheep, instead of uniting them. Notwithstanding the many insinuations which the writer has seen fit to throw out in his reply, it does not appear that I have said anything from which he ought to have inferred that I was disposed to give the least countenance to slavery either in the church or out of it. It is true I could not appreciate his views of church reform, and thereby recognize the different religious denominations of our land, as being totally anti-Christian in their character. And it seems that on this account, and this only, he has been pleased to stigmatize me as "arguing against church purification," as "fighting against the truth," as "plauding fifteen years for incorrigible offenders," as "having charity for systematic robbery, murder, incest, and adultery," together with a long catalogue of crimes which slavery permits; and that, Methodist laws cover up and Calvinists encourage. And, as it would seem, with special reference to myself, he also asserts, that abolitionists constitute the bulwark and hiding place of slavery; thus making me out, as I should judge, vastly more guilty than it is possible for any slaveholder to be. And yet, though he has fixed such a weight of guilt and responsibility on myself, he nevertheless apologizes for me, by saying that he doubts not my sincerity, and by calling me brother not less than a dozen times in his communication. Now I aver that, according to his own showing, he is at least in the same condemnation with myself. For, while he censures me for apologizing for the church and for remaining in it, he also apologizes for me, and remains in connection with a political party which, if his reasoning be correct, is the bulwark and hiding-place of slavery. How can he do this? Is it consistent for him, after having, in the fear of God, withdrawn from all pro-slavery churches, still to adhere to a political party which is the bulwark and hiding-place of slavery? "Is slavery any better in the Liberty party than out of it?" Is abolition fellowship for slavery holy and consistent? "Is slavery wrong in Methodism and congregationalism, and right in abolitionism?" "Is it wrong in the church and right in the Liberty party?" "Or does he think that by remaining in the Liberty party he can turn it into action, and thereby exert a good influence?" These, and the like inquiries, I shall leave for his consideration, and pass to observe that Scripture example, and the example of the most eminent modern reformers, fully sustain the position which I have herein maintained. Moses and the prophets were associated with a people that were noted for being stiff-necked and rebellious. And yet, notwithstanding this, we learn nothing from their history favorable to secession. It is true Jeremiah did, on one occasion, in consequence of the unparalleled spread of wickedness, indulge himself in a wish "that he might leave his people and be at rest." But that does not appear that even this was ever granted him. Our Savior, whilst he was here on earth, strictly adhered to the Jewish church, ever acknowledging its authority, and strictly observing its ordinances, though he was Lord of all. And the apostles, following his example, continued so to do until the temple was destroyed, and an end thereby put to the Jewish polity. And yet, during this whole time, the Jewish church was well nigh as corrupt as it possibly could be. At the commencement of the reformation, the corruptions of the church of Rome

were such as to truly astonish the world. And yet Martin Luther, following the example set by Christ and his apostles, adhered to the church until he had laid the foundation of the reformation deep and wide. Nor did he even then separate from the church until there was no alternative left him but to either do so or else recant his principles. Had he done otherwise, and in the commencement of his work seceded from the church, "the leaves of popery would not have been purged out, and protestantism would have died in the shell." But he, taking the course which should be pursued by every reformer, labored first of all to reform the church to which he belonged, of its errors;—and no doubt would have continued so to do until the whole Roman church had been reformed, and until death had put an end to his labors, and not the pope, in order to put an end to his further success, issued his bull of excommunication against him. And John Wesley, pursuing the same course in relation to the English church, notwithstanding all its corruptions, continued his relationship to it unto the end of his life. To me, therefore, it is evident that we, as Christians, owe allegiance, first of all, to our Maker; it is our duty to labor, to the utmost of our ability, to reform the church to which we belong, of its errors. And if we can discharge this duty and still retain our relationship to it, as did Wesley, we ought not to be censured for so doing. But if the discharge of this duty should bring us into contact with the church, or its constituted authorities, so that we should be left, as was Luther, to the only alternative of a separation from the church or a recantation of our principles; to separate, in that case, would be an inevitable duty. And God would not only approve us in so doing, but in case we should, of necessity, become a distinct sect, he would, nevertheless, own us as his people, "tho' Abraham should be ignorant of us, and Israel acknowledge us not."

The entertaining of these views, and the having become convinced of the exceeding sinfulness of slavery, has led me to adopt the course which I have here related to. At the commencement of the abolition movement, I found myself in the pale of a church which, from the nature of its organization, must ever be a mighty engine either for good or evil. And, owing to a provision of its original principle, it was, at that time, a mighty bulwark of slavery. But this circumstance, so far from influencing me to leave the church, was a special inducement for remaining in it. Having been an itinerant from my youth, I had consequently a large circle of friends over which I could exercise an influence favorable to the oppressed. And as I was constantly having new fields of labor, I was continually having new opportunities for extending that influence. This field of labor, therefore, which providence seemed to assign me, I did not feel at liberty to abandon. Had I done so, I should have deserted my post, and in my own esteem have been like the hireling who, when he seeth the wolf coming, leaveth the sheep and fleeth. It was also apparent that the different sections of the church were so identified with each other, and that such was their unity, that two such opposite principles as slavery and anti-slavery, could not long exist in it without coming in direct contact with each other. Every movement of the abolitionists at the north would, in the nature of things, be followed by a corresponding movement of the slaveholders at the south, until the question would be brought to a direct issue and the church be compelled to take some action in the case as would leave to one or the other of the parties no alternative but to either separate from the church or else abandon their principles. But such was the blindness that then pervaded our land, and so strong was the hold which slavery had upon the church, that it could not reasonably be expected that this crisis would be brought about in a moment, nor without some very special and systematic efforts on the part of the friends of the slave. How far these anticipations have been realized, and what is the present state of the controversy, the doings of the late convention of slaveholding Methodists at Louisville, Ky. will, to some extent, show.

(To be continued.)

ALBANY, JULY 27, 1845.

Letter from Delia A. Webster.

To the Editors of the Freeman.—GENTLEMEN:—Having been informed that numbers, both in this community and abroad, have derived from some portion of my remarks on slavery, the impression that I believe it a moral wrong to aid in the escape of slaves from servitude; and being asked a further explanation by some of your readers, who have been so kind as to manifest a deep and heartfelt sympathy in my misfortune, I am induced to ask for this note an insertion in the columns of your highly valued paper. I regret that I did not express my views more clearly and more fully on this head, as I would not be understood to say that I would think it morally wrong to do anything for the slave, which we would wish done for us, were we slaves ourselves. I merely expressed my opinion in relation to the expediency of first planning his escape, and seducing him away; and which opinion I am told is erroneous. It may be I am entirely mistaken in my views on this point, and I desire instruction. Perhaps it was wrong in me to venture an opinion until better informed; for my opportunity for observation has by no means been extensive. I would not dare say, that no combination of circumstances could exist, where a person would not only be justifiable, but even commendable, in laying motives before the slave to induce his escape. For I believe I could name some, where even slaveholders themselves would not consider the act in the least degree blameworthy. Some have asked me if I thought it right and lawful, even after the slaves had got into the free states, instead of returning them to their master, to aid them on their way to Canada? In reply, I will merely add, that I have never questioned the propriety of rendering assistance wherever it is needed, in my power to do so. And when I chance to meet a wayfaring stranger, who is hungry, cold, or weary, it is with pleasure that I feed, clothe, or help him to a night's lodging; and if he wants a few shillings, I freely give it;—and God forbid, while I have health to labor, that I should stop my ears at the cry of the poor, or turn my back upon the needy. Nor would I stop to

inquire whether the sufferer was a freeman, and suddenly reduced by some dire calamity from affluence to penury and need, or whether all his life he had been a slave, crouching under the iron rod of oppression, and his honest earned wages kept back by the stealthy hand of the oppressor. I say, I would not stop to ask these questions; but my first concern should be to see his wants supplied. And should I then learn the former to be the case, I could shed the tear of pity over his reverse of fortune, and wish him a happier lot. But if perchance, it should be the latter, so opposed am I to delivering back the slave that has escaped from his master, with tears of joy I would congratulate his successful flight, and bid him God-speed to the asylum of Canada. Yes, I would open my purse, and, if he needed, bestow upon him the last dollar. I have done it once;—yes more, and would do it again. Or, if he chose to dwell on the verdant shores of Champlain among our nominal mountains of freedom, I would cordially bid him welcome, and use my feeble influence (if need be, at the hazard of my life) to protect his rights. And he, in his humble opinion, who would not do as much, is either destitute of the feelings of a human being, or is grossly ignorant of the appalling degradation of slavery.

Nor should I stop to inquire whether the Constitution of the United States justified the recapture of the slave, and required the citizens of this State to return him to the manstealer, for I consider no code of laws made by man obligatory, which are diametrically opposed to the laws written with the finger of God.

Yours, &c.
D. A. WEBSTER.

FERRISBURGH, AUG. 19, 1845.

For the Freeman.

Is it So?

History informs us of some subjects of an aristocratic government, who were dissatisfied with their laws, which forbade the privilege of worshipping God in their own way, and they chose to suffer privations in the wilderness rather than live under such rule.

Like sincere friends of truth they steered their course toward a land of red men and wild beasts, braving the Ocean's storms, relying on their own exertions and the care of a common Parent for success. They reached the place of their destination and planted there a colony of Reformers. In a short time sickness annoyed them and death swept off half their number in six months, yet they persevered, & chose to tax their exertion & ingenuity rather than be taxed by the Priests for a doctrine to which they could not subscribe.

They remonstrated with their oppressors, but in vain—the evil grew until forbearance ceased to be a virtue; they then published to the world one of the most able documents ever written, setting forth their wrongs and asserting their rights, and to maintain those rights, pledged to each other their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor, declared their independence, and war was the result.

Their enemies fell before their instruments of death by thousands; they conquered—and the conductors of this work of death have been applauded for their bravery and love of Liberty by the whole world.

An obscure individual volunteered as a soldier of the revolution in the struggle for liberty, fought in all the battles through the war—at its close, married a wife from among the daughters of the colonists, reared nine sons and a daughter, who have often been seen gathered around the "old arm chair," listening to their father's story of the war for Liberty, which always closed with the injunction upon the sons, to maintain and defend to the latest day of their lives, the rich inheritance so dearly bought with the blood of their father.

The Patriarch of Liberty framed a new government, perfectly free in all its parts; it was the united wisdom of the best men of the age, applauded at home and abroad, as the cradle of Freedom, the Asylum of the oppressed, and the home of the brave and free.

Under this government, our old soldier received ninety-six dollars a year, after the war, until his death. Now the father being dead, the mother with nine children are claimed as slaves, and sold at auction, to the highest bidder in the market! The sons, taught to love freedom, soon began to give evidence that "as the twig is bent the tree's inclined," and for a peaceful attempt to become free-men, they were punished with two hundred lashes of the whip—yet the father's last words of Liberty kept sounding in their ears, and after twenty years of slavery, two sons succeeded in escaping to aid in the escape of slaves from servitude; and being asked a further explanation by some of your readers, who have been so kind as to manifest a deep and heartfelt sympathy in my misfortune, I am induced to ask for this note an insertion in the columns of your highly valued paper.

The father received ninety-six dollars a year for fighting for his Liberty.—The sons received each, two hundred lashes on their naked backs, for presuming to be free—and the man who dared to say they were freemen, now lies in a dungeon for the crime.

Do you ask where this outrage is practised?—I answer in these United States!

Was it right for our fathers to FIGHT for their freedom and wrong for their sons PEACEABLY to seek freedom?

Must American citizens flee to Canada to find a refuge from Slavery?

Is that a FREE government, where men, women and children, are sold at public auction in the street?

Sons of New England, in behalf of three millions of bond-men—for humanity's sake, and the dying request of our Revolutionary fathers, will you permit these abuses to exist?

I beseech you to act like true sons of those Revolutionary Fathers, and answer these questions at the BALLOT BOX.

LIBERTY.

Essentials of a thorough Liberty-Man.—There are two principles, says the Emancipator, essential to a thoroughgoing Liberty man. These two are, 1st. A fixed conviction that we are not to mix, merge, coalesce, or confederate with either of the other parties that now divide the land. 2d, that we are to use the means with the determination and sure expectation of overthrowing both the other parties, and bringing the government of the United States under the control of our principles.

From the Boston Morning Chronicle.

THE GREAT LIBERTY CONVENTION.

In to-day's paper will be found the call or invitation for a Liberty Convention, to be composed of delegates from New England, New York, New Jersey and Pennsylvania, to meet in Boston, on Wednesday, the first day of October next. The expediency of holding a convention and the time and place for its assembling, have been determined upon after a comparison of all the opinions drawn from an extensive correspondence with many leading friends of Liberty in Ohio, and other States. These questions being settled, it only remains to ask, Shall we have a Convention worthy of the Crisis and the Cause?

The Liberty party was formed to promote the prime object announced in the declaration of sentiments adopted by the convention which organized the American Anti Slavery Society; 'the abolition of slavery by moral and political action.' This is its avowed, its real object. It is a party of 'one idea'—an idea whose scope is too large to be grasped by any other existing political party in the nation. This idea is the bond of its union, the secret of its strength.—To abandon it, to commingle it with other ideas would dissolve the uniting tie of the tried and determined band, which, in a dark hour, staked their all upon the deliverance of three millions of American slaves from a cruel bondage, and the whole American people from their foulest shame, their deadliest curse.

The object to be secured and the mode adopted by the Liberty party for its accomplishment may challenge the loftiest reach of philanthropy, the broadest scope of statesmanship. The basis that party furnishes a platform on which all true friends of the slave, who have faith in human agency for the attainment of human ends, must rally. These professed enemies of slavery who cannot stand on this basis, possess few elements, mental or moral, which can be made available for ultimate success in our undertaking. As they may regard this basis as too narrow or too broad, too exclusive or too general, so will their principles and measures be found in practice either too ethereal for mortal use, or too temporizing to endure the trials which the reform will encounter at every step of its progress.

To its 'one idea,' then, let the Liberty party adhere. Clinging to it, and the cause is safe—abandon it, and all is lost. Though our immediate progress will be apparently slow, our final triumph will be certain and complete. Nor is the horizon of the Liberty movement even now destitute of bright signs of promise. Never has the anti-slavery sentiment had so strong a hold upon the public conscience, as at this hour. Directly and indirectly, in the church and in the state, at the North and at the South, by the fleeing of the fugitive and the trembling of the oppressor, we discover pregnant indications that the day of the slave's redemption draweth nigh. And in this time to falter, in the attack—this the spot to change the order of battle! Not our party recently passed through the ordeal which tried its principles and tested its policy. The trial and the test compacted its ranks and inspired its courage. Its heart is sound, purpose unshaken.

The campaign of 1845 has been opened with a series of conventions distinguished for their wisdom, ability and enthusiasm. To give an impulse to a movement so nobly begun, a great convention for the eastern and middle States was projected, and is now formally invoked. The names appended to the invitation, have long been familiar to the abolitionists of the Union. We speak but the unanimous sentiment of our friends when we say, that their call will be as cheerfully responded to, as it is heartily uttered. Maine, the vanguard State, bordering on those dominions whose soil will not bear the foot print of a slave—she will come. New Hampshire, though disgraced by the rule of politicians whose proslavery will hardly find a parallel in the annals of party, yet the banner State—she will come.—Vermont, whose independent sons are as free as their own mountain air, and whose laws never recognized the relation of master and slave—she will come. Rhode Island, where civil feuds have too long stifled the cry of crushed millions, will send her abolitionists of by-gone days to renew their pledges at the altar of humanity—she will come. Connecticut, the land of steady habits, slow to change even from wrong to right, furnishing some of the choicest spirits in the Liberty host—she will come. New York, from the quays of her commercial emporium, and the banks of her Hudson, from the meandering lines of her canals and the fertile plains which border her lakes—New York, ever foremost in the conflict—she will come. New Jersey, protesting against that "broad seal" which covers a thousand slaves, and those judicial Pharisees who will not let the oppressed go free—she will come. Pennsylvania, repudiating the domination of rulers who cant of democracy and practice tyranny, and emulating the precepts and example of her great founder—she will come. So, too, we hope that Ohio, Michigan, and the States still beyond, will not stay behind. As to the Liberty men of our own Massachusetts, we will pledge our faith that they will be present in large numbers, and with an open hand and a glowing heart, welcome to their world-renowned Faneuil Hall their brethren from the other States of the Union.

WHINE, WHINE, WHINE!

It is ludicrous to see how the whig editors whine about the votes cast by the Liberty party, at the same time that they affect to despise them for the smallness of their number, and the insignificance of their principles. Has it come to this, that the great and immaculate whig party, so proud in its triumph of 1840—so fastidious in its associations during Tyler's reign—so confident of its strength in 1844, has been utterly overwhelmed by a handful of despised abolitionists, and its leaders reduced to the necessity of a continual whining, whining, whining, about a few votes, cast in a few states, for freedom? Why, we would pity them, if we were not obliged to laugh at their folly. The rank and file of the party, except here and there a greenhorn, utterly despise this whining of their process, and would gladly throw off the leaders that have led them into such a dilemma.—Ohio Amer.

Maine Liberty Address—Extract.

But, fellow citizens, you will probably say, that admitting all the evils of slavery as they affect the religious and moral character of our country, and justly as we may be, by cherishing and upholding, and extending slavery, rendered obnoxious to the charge of being a nation of hypocrites, of being false to all our professions of a love of liberty, of just an equal rights to all men—feeling as we do that slavery is the great controlling interest of the country, and fast drawing into its vortex all others—what remedy shall we apply to cure the evil, and how shall we apply it?

The question is natural and pertinent. And we respectfully, answer it, in the first place, by asking of you by what means, the slave power, or, in other words, the slaveholders have acquired, and, for near half a century, held the controlling power in the government, while they have ever been, in numbers, a small minority, and the freemen have always been a great majority? The answer, though not honorable to our sagacity, or evidence of strong attachment to the great principles of liberty, is obvious. Slavery, with the people of the slave states, is the great undivided, absorbing interest, or deemed so to be, however erroneously. Hence, whatever they may call themselves, whether democrat or whig, as minor interests may prompt, on all questions, which they suppose may affect the interests of slavery, the slaveholding states present an undivided front. In servile ranks they ally in support of the institution of slavery. No matter that under its deadly influence, religion is but another name for oppression, and duelling and assassination an index to their code of morality and honor—no matter that under its influence they may be growing poor, so long as they can draw the deficiency from your hard earnings, no matter that they are receiving the contempt and scorn of the civilized world, they cling to slavery, and will while they can gratify the lust for arbitrary and irresponsible power and their love of idleness, and vicious indulgence. While they can fatten on the spoils of office, or revel on the luxuries extorted from unrequited labor—on the contrary, the citizens of the free states have no such interest, one undivided, round which to cluster, and on which to concentrate their efforts. They have from the commencement, been divided into two great political parties, each believing that the interest of the country would be best promoted by having their own partisans in the administration of the government and so nearly balanced, that the ascendancy could only be acquired and maintained by severe and protracted struggles, each party has sought aid from the slaveholders, and courted it more or less subversively to the slaveholding power, and prepared to sustain this one favorite institution of slaveholders. The excess of parties in the free states has usually been in proportion to the abject devotion, manifested to the slave power.

From the very organization of the two great political parties in the free states, and as the experience of more than forty years has shown, they will and necessarily must be wielded in the hands of slaveholders, as instruments to batter down the great principles of liberty, equality of human rights, on which our free, republican institutions are founded, and which are antagonist to slavery, that dispirited, but only cherished, institution of one half, and soon to be a majority of the states of this Union.

Yes, fellow citizens, it is by your divisions, while we hope and believe you are all aiming at one great object, the protection and perpetuation of free institutions, that slavery has been lengthening her cords and strengthening her stakes, till she has planted herself in the seat of power, showing that she is the God of our Country.

But do you ask, if the two great political parties are to be abandoned, what does the Liberty party expect or hope to accomplish? Fellow Citizens, the great principle of the Liberty party is hostility to slavery—eternal enmity to this abominable institution—the re-establishment of those great principles of Freedom, which our fathers fought to secure, and which slavery has cloven down—the inalienable right of every human being of every complexion, and kindred, and language, to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. Is this a weak party? You fellow citizens can make it strong. Is it a despised party? You can make it respectable. Is it a fearful minority in the United States? The people of the free States can make it the majority. It can wipe out the stain of slavery from our capital. It can prevent the admission of more slave states into the Union. It can cut off that fungus, Texas, which unconsciously, has been engrafted on the tree of liberty. It can confine the monster within its constitutional limits, and there leave it to moulder in its own intrinsic rotteness, till it becomes the loathing of those who fancy beauty in its form and proportions. What prevents this consummation so devoutly to be wished? The power is with the voters in the free states. Is it but for them to will it, and it is peacefully, quietly, safely and constitutionally done. Let the still small voice of the ballot box utter your fiat that slavery shall cease, from our land, and that voice will be reverberated in thunder tones through the length and breadth of our whole Country—liberty to the captive and the opening of the prison to them that are bound.

Who ANNEXED TEXAS?—Mistify as you may, neighbor, these facts are incontrovertible—that John Tyler, was elected by the Whigs—that he took Daniel Webster into his cabinet, who was driven out by the clamors of the whig leaders—that his place was supplied by John C. Calhoun, whose appointment was confirmed by a Whig Senate,—that Tyler, Calhoun & Co., projected the gigantic scheme of annexation—that a Whig, introduced resolutions in the House to consummate this scheme, and that a Whig Senate also passed them—that these same resolutions were forwarded by John Tyler to the Texian government, and adopted by it. So here is the matter in a nutshell. Let each one draw his own conclusions from the premises.—Mercer Lumis, ary.

From the Boston Morning Chronicle.

WHIG CHARGES.

The Whig papers charge the Liberty party with assisting to elect Polk, and as a necessary consequence, with the annexation of Texas. I am something of a Whig myself, taking from the post-office not less than three of those papers regularly; but their insinuation has become so rampant, and their logic so preposterous, that I cannot bear it any longer without attempting a reply.

In 1839, Henry Clay denounced the Abolitionists in the Senate of the United States, handing us over to the tender mercies of the mob law. He also asserted that two centuries of legislation had sanctioned and sanctified negro slavery; adding, what the law declared property was properly. This declaration was received with joy by the South, and Calhoun embraced him on the spot, but it shocked and disgusted every friend of the slave.

In 1840, the Whigs in the Harrisburgh Convention were so confident that these sentiments would be remembered by the abolitionists, as well as his conduct in regard to the Missouri compromise, that they considered him not available, and another candidate for the presidency was selected. Even the success of Harrison, however, was doubtful, for he had once before been run off the track; and the leaders of the party made uncommon exertions. The powers of darkness, through the agency of hard cider, log cabins, and con skins, were invoked, and prevailed; and they hoisted in the old soldier so high over his opponent, that many thought they could do whatever they undertook. It was not, therefore, because the Baltimore Convention believed Clay's offences were forgotten, that they ventured to nominate him—they did it in open defiance to every Abolitionist in the land. In the mean time, however, the locos had learned that "some things could be done as well as others"—that electioneering was a game that two could play at—and they succeeded.

Now it appears to me that the charge against the Liberty party of assisting to elect Polk, comes with a very bad grace from those who disregard their wishes, and shocked their feelings by nominating the man who, of all others, had done more to extend the blighting curse of slavery over this continent. If those editors had not eaten shame and drank after it, they would hide their heads from the presence of all honest men.

But they say if abolitionists had not voted for Birney, Clay would have been elected, because most of them were originally Whigs. This however, is not to the point. These assertions are either doubtful or untrue, where I am best acquainted; and besides, no abolitionist who was guided by principle more than by party, could vote for a pro-slavery candidate. The very idea is absurd. Depend upon it, if any did so, they were not more than half cured—half baked—or half twisted.

Webster said indeed, that "whoever gives a vote for Birney, gives half a vote for Polk"; and why did he not add, that the other half went for Clay? It did not suit his purpose; and doubtless hoped that by this sophistry he could bewilder the intellects of some honest voter. Now observe this logic. A vote for Birney—who could not be elected, and a vote for the man in the moon or nobody—who could not serve,—must have the same effect, or rather no effect at all, on either Clay's or Polk's election; and any assertion to the contrary, acts common sense at defiance.

AN ELECTION.

Who voted for neither Birney, Clay nor Polk.

WORTHY OF NOTICE.

Anti-Slavery men cannot obtain justice from their opponents in the free States. Their measures are denounced, their motives questioned, and when a change in public sentiment takes place on the subject of slavery too palpable to be denied, it is denied that we have had any influence in producing it. On the contrary, it has come to pass despite their injurious course! What the cause is, is another question. No one pretends to give any explanation. The truth is, the change just happened, without any cause at all!

Very different is it in the slave States. When a man there becomes penetrated with a conviction of the evil of slavery, and filled with a purpose to move for its extinction, he feels at once that his natural allies are the anti-slavery men of the free States. To them he looks for efficient sympathy—to their efforts he attributes the healthful changes in sentiment in regard to slavery, which have already taken place—their measures he is disposed to adopt—their characters he is brave enough to vindicate.

The anti-slavery men of the free States will yet have to look for justice to their brethren in the slave States. The fire of oppression there, is quick-sighted to discern his real friends.—Cin. Herald.

HIDE YOUR TIME.

A cardinal fault with those who undertake reformatory movements, is, that they will not 'hide their time.' They become impatient with slow progress, and the long delay of success, forgetting that society retreats, but one of its false steps at a time, and must be reasoned with and persuaded at every step. Patience—patience, is the great virtue needed by all who are in advance of the age. They must wait till all those they have left behind, catch up with them, nor tire waiting. Let patience have her perfect work. And patience begeth experience, and experience, hope, and hope maketh not ashamed.

"Hide your time—one false step taken Perils all you yet have done, Undismayed—erect—unshaken— Watch and wait—and all is won. 'Tis not by a rash endeavor Men of state to greatness climb; Would you win your rights forever, Calm and thoughtful—hide your time."

"Take the LIBERTY PARTY: They stand by the Constitution in its whole letter and spirit, and are for equal and equitable reform only."—C. M. Clay.